



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Shufeldt's 'Scientific Taxidermy for Museums.'¹—This memoir is presented by Dr. Shufeldt as the result of studies of mounted specimens largely in the collections of the United States National Museum, made by him at the request of the authorities of that Institution. As an expert whose opinion could be considered authoritative, he was desired to make a critical examination of the specimens of taxidermy displayed "in the National Museum and Smithsonian Institution" and to suggest plans for further improving exhibits of this nature.

Dr. Shufeldt's essay opens with a general review of the taxidermist's profession and its requirements. He compares the old with the 'New Taxidermy' and, in our opinion, rightly claims for the latter a place among the arts. Then follows a detailed consideration of many examples of the taxidermist's skill, including representatives of Invertebrates, Fishes, Reptiles, Birds, and Mammals. This part of the paper, covering 48 pages, is very fully illustrated by 82 full-page half-tone plates from photographs of the specimens described and commented upon.

Dr. Shufeldt's remarks are timely. The day has arrived when the work of the artist-taxidermist should receive the attention it deserves. The day has passed when the name taxidermist can be applied to the whole group of animal stuffers and mounters, from the village barber, who 'sets up' a pet cat or canary, to the expert modeller of a bison.

It is only within comparatively recent years that taxidermy could rightly claim rank as an art. Its development is in part due to the cumulative agency of transmitted experience, but more especially to the establishment of departments of taxidermy in our large museums. Here, secure of a salary which is in no way affected by the amount of work performed, the artist-taxidermist can give full scope to his originality. Patience and an unlimited amount of time are absolutely necessary adjuncts of the higher class of taxidermy. For this reason, even when other things are equal, the commercial taxidermist cannot compete with the museum worker. If the former should devote one half the time to his subjects that the latter conscientiously gives to his, he would become bankrupt. His customers, the public, are not educated to a proper appreciation of truly artistic taxidermy and they are therefore given no more than their money's worth. In other words, they pay a low price for an inferior class of work.

Dr. Shufeldt is therefore to be thanked for his clear exposition of the differences which exist between the trade and the art of taxidermy. Let us hope his words will so open the eyes of the public to the merits of this new art that a taxidermist may feel warranted in establishing a studio whose patrons shall not be purchasers of rugs and feather screens, but in a strict sense patrons of the arts.—F. M. C.

¹Scientific Taxidermy for Museums (Based on a Study of the United States Government Collections). By R. W. Shufeldt, M. D. Report U. S. Nat. Mus. (for 1892), pp. 369-436. Pll. xv-xcvi. Washington, 1894.

Stone's Revision of the Genus *Anous*.¹—Mr. Stone recognizes seven species of the genus *Anous*, one of which, *A. atrofuscus*, is described as new, and he has apparently done good service in straightening out the complicated synonymy of the group. A synoptic table is given of the species.—J. A. A.

Stone on the Old World Rallinæ.²—Says Mr. Stone: "Having had occasion to make a thorough investigation of the literature bearing upon the Old World Rails, I think it desirable to prepare the following list of the described species and genera which brings together in one paper all the references to published descriptions. Lack of sufficient material has prevented me from making a monographic study of the group, but where specimens were at hand I have been able to judge of the specific relations of various described forms and to arrange the synonymy accordingly." Mr. Stone's paper was prepared independently of Dr. Sharpe's recent work on the group, as finally set forth in Vol. XXIII of the British Museum 'Catalogue of Birds,' which appeared almost coincidentally with Mr. Stone's paper. Mr. Stone, however, refers to Sharpe's paper on the Rallidæ published in 'The Ibis' in 1893. It is therefore of interest to compare the views of the two authors. The number of genera recognized for this group by Mr. Stone is 23, with 3 additional subgenera; by Mr. Sharpe, 33. Mr. Stone formally recognizes 88 species; Mr. Sharpe, 88,—a remarkable agreement in respect to the number of species admitted. The order of arrangement of the genera is very different in the two publications.

Mr. Stone gives a chronological list of the "generic names which have been proposed for the Old World Rails"—38 in all—from 1758 to 1893, excluding, however, a number proposed by Heine in 1890. In commenting on these names, he states that *Ortygometra* Leach is simply a synonym of *Crex*, though wrongly used in another connection. He disapproves of Mr. Sharpe's recognition of so many generic divisions of the old genus *Porzana*, and considers that while *Zapornia* and *Coturnicops* (= '*Ortygops*' of Sharpe) may stand as subgenera, *Phalaridion* and *Rallites* must be regarded as merely synonyms of *Porzana*. No new names, either generic or specific, appear to be proposed, but two generic names that have been in more or less common use are shown to be preoccupied, and later names are properly adopted in their stead; namely, *Sarothrura* Heine for *Corethrura* Reich.; *Euryzona* Bon. for *Rallina* Reich. nec Gray. The body of the paper consists of a synonymic list of the genera and species, with their habitats, and more or less technical comment on questions of nomenclature.—J. A. A.

¹ A Revision of the Genus *Anous*. By Witmer Stone. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila., 1894, pp. 115-118.

² A Review of the Old World Rallinæ. By Witmer Stone. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila., 1894, pp. 130-149.